

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Christopher T. Wilder,)	C/A No. 0:19-2691-SAL-PJG
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
LT Woods; Cpt. Bradham; SGT James)	
Williams; SGT Walker; SGT Wiggins; Major)	
Washington; SGT Hanes; Warden Lervern)	
Cohen,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The plaintiff has filed this action, *pro se*, seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff, an inmate with the South Carolina Department of Corrections (“SCDC”), alleges violations of his constitutional rights by the named defendants. The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on June 17, 2020, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 48.) As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court entered an order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), on June 18, 2020, advising the plaintiff of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for him to file an adequate response. (ECF No. 49.) The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, the defendants’ motion may be granted, thereby ending his case.

Despite his extension of time and notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's Roseboro order, the plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action.¹

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the plaintiff shall advise the court as to whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to the defendants' motion for summary judgment within fourteen (14) days from the date of this order. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, **this action will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute.** See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

July 30, 2020
Columbia, South Carolina


Paige J. Gossett
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The defendants' attorney informed the court that it appears that the plaintiff may no longer be housed at the Ridgeland Correctional Institution. However, none of the court's orders has been returned to the Clerk of Court as undeliverable. Moreover, when the plaintiff filed this action, he was specifically instructed to keep the Clerk of Court advised in writing if his address changed, and that his failure to do so may result in his case being dismissed. (See Orders, ECF No. 5 at 3, ECF No. 12 at 3.)